

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujimoto (U.S. 6,191,903). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are now patentable over Fujimoto for the reasons set forth below.

Figures 4 and 5 of Fujimoto illustrate that Fujimoto uses eight different sync patterns which are used consecutively in a data stream.

Applicants' invention, as recited by Claim 1, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely: ...wherein said sync patterns are limited to two different sync patterns within three immediately consecutive sync patterns in said data stream.

This feature is supported by the originally filed application at page 20, lines 15-18. No new matter has been added.

Thus, in accordance with the above claimed feature, Applicants are able to transmit data packets using no more than two different sync patterns. While applicants' data stream may include more than two different sync patterns at various locations, applicants are able to correctly transmit a data stream that has two identical sync patterns within three immediately consecutive sync patterns. In this manner, the probability of pseudo sync patterns is lower than in the prior art. In addition, this feature provides the simplicity of a variable-pattern occurrence. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 12, 13 and 15 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claim 14, while not identical to claim 1, is patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 7 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claim 7 has been rewritten accordingly.

Application No.: 09/646,665
Amendment Dated: March 30, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: October 30, 2006

MAT-8014US

Claims 3-6, 25-30, and 32-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto. Claims 25 and 34, while not identical to claim 1, are patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. The remaining claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims.

Claims 1, 3-6, 12-15, 25-30, and 32-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (U.S. 5,289,476). Regarding claims 1, 14, 25, and 34, these claims again recite the feature of "said sync patterns are limited to two different sync patterns within three immediately consecutive sync patterns in said data stream." Johnson neither discloses nor suggests the above feature. Furthermore, Applicants' dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants' claims listed above are patentable over Johnson.

Claims 31 and 36 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten into independent form. Claims 31 and 36 have been rewritten accordingly.

Claims 17 and 22 (and dependent claims thereon) include allowable subject matter. A statement regarding the allowability of those claims is respectfully requested.



Application No.: 09/646,665
Amendment Dated: March 30, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: October 30, 2006

MAT-8014US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Rather Prestia

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/mjc/bj

Dated: March 30, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

March 30, 2007

Beth Johnson

134825